

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,969	08/20/2003	Takashi Ishikawa	031015	4974
38834	7590 09/21/2005		EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			SANDERS, KRIELLION ANTIONETTE	
1250 CONNE SUITE 700	INECTICUT AVENUE, NW 0		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20036	1714		
	•		DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

vó

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commons	10/643,969	ISHIKAWA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Kriellion A. Sanders	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	·_					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	-					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 803. 1 Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:						

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, requires the specification to be written in "full, clear, concise, and exact terms." The specification is replete with terms which are not clear, concise and exact. The specification should be revised carefully in order to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. An example of some unclear, inexact or verbose terms used in the specification is: At the paragraph bridging pages 1 and 2 the sentence is unclear in the phrase, "with the strength in a direction that right angle to the laminate planes being extremely low...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. The term "volumetric content" in claim is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "volumetric content" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. It is not clear what total unit of measurement the volumetric content is based upon..

Application/Control Number: 10/643,969 Page 3

Art Unit: 1714

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

- 6. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the literature reference to Ranta et al, cited on applicant's form 1449.
- Ranta et al discloses a method for dispersing carbon nanofibers in an epoxy resin, wherein the resulting "matrix" is then used in filament winding. Applicant has attempted to differentiate over this reference at page 3 of his specification by stating that, "this attempt was concluded that the carbon nanotubes dispersed resin did not affect the mechanical properties of the filament winding composites". This statement does not differentiate from the presently claimed invention since there is no claimed indication that the carbon nanotubes dispersed resin of the present claims must effect the mechanical properties of the fiber reinforcement. The filament winding of the reference correlates to applicant's fiber reinforcement. The resulting filaments of the invention include 11 layers of carbon nanofiber impregnated epoxy that has been dispersed into the filament winding. See page 1779, 2.3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1714

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the literature reference to Ranta et al, cited on applicant's form 1449 as applied to claims 1 and 3 above and in view of the following remarks.
- 10. The ordinary practitioner in this art would have found it obvious to formulate a filament winding having fewer than 11 layers or even a single layer of the Ranta et al composites depending upon the intended function of the final product.

11.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kriellion A. Sanders whose telephone number is 571-272-1122. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Page 5

Kriellion A. Sanders Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

ks